

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application as presently amended and in light of the following discussion is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-4, 6-21 and 23-39 are pending. Claims 1, 3, 9, 10, 13, and 39 have been amended by the present response.

In the outstanding Office Action, the drawings were objected to; Claims 1, 3-7, 10-21 and 23-39 were rejected as being unpatentable over the combination of DeMello et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,368,418) in view of Elton et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,853,565); and Claims 2 and 8 were rejected as being unpatentable over DeMello in view of Elton and in further of view of Elton '166. Furthermore, Claim 9 was indicated as containing allowable subject matter. Applicants appreciatively acknowledge the identification of allowable subject matter.

In reply, a new drawing, Figure 5 has been added to include the connection of a suppression filter to a Y connection for a three phase circuit.

Claim 1 has been amended to place the claim in conventional U.S. claim format. Furthermore, the claim has been amended to refer to a current-carrying conductor that includes a plurality of strands, and at least a portion of said strands being insulated strands. Support for this amendment is found at page 11, lines 5-8, and therefore no new matter is added. It is believed that the identification of allowable subject matter in Claim 9, as discussed on page 8 of the outstanding Office Action, is based on the current carrying conductor having insulated strands. Moreover, these insulated strands are used in the context of an electric machine, which is different than anything disclosed in either Elton or DeMello. As noted, the Examiner identified that Takaoka is directed to high voltage power lines and thus is not applicable to either Elton or DeMello. Because Claim 1 includes this feature of having a portion of the strands of the current carrying conductor being insulated strands, it is respectfully submitted that Claim 1 patentably defines over any combination of Elton and

DeMello. Each of the other claims depends from Claim 1, as amended, and therefore also patentably defines over the asserted prior art. Claim 39 is an independent claim but includes a similar provision to that discussed above with regard to Claim 1 (namely the inclusion of insulated strands). Therefore it is believed that Claim 39 also patentably defines over the asserted prior art.

Consequently, in view of the present amendment and in light of the foregoing comments, it is respectfully submitted that the invention defined by Claims 1-4 and 6-21, and 23-39, as amended, is patentably distinguishing over the prior art. The present application is therefore believed to be in condition for formal allowance and an early and favorable reconsideration of this application is therefore requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Bradley D. Lytle
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 40,073

Customer Number

22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 06/04)

BDL\la

I:\ATTY\BDL\9847\196975US-AM.DOC